SOCIALISM

ITS STRENGTH, WEAKNESS PROBLEMS AND FUTURE

ALFRED RAYMOND JOHNS

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 9 1919
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division HX20
Section .J65

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 9 1919
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SOCIALISM

ITS STRENGTH, WEAKNESS PROBLEMS AND FUTURE

BY
ALFRED RAYMOND JOHNS

With Introduction by
CHARLES STELZLE

NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS
CINCINNATI: JENNINGS & GRAHAM

Copyright, 1913, by
ALFRED RAYMOND JOHNS

First Edition Printed April, 1913
Reprinted December, 1913

DEDICATED TO

THE MEMORY OF MY FATHER,

ALFRED JOHNS,

AND MY WIFE'S FATHER,

NEWELL JAMES MOORS,

BOTH,

ALL THEIR LIVES,

CHRISTIAN WORKINGMEN.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE 7

INTRODUCTION 9

CHAPTER I

FOREWORD 15

CHAPTER II

WHAT SOCIALISM IS NOT 17

CHAPTER III

WHAT IS SOCIALISM? 19

CHAPTER IV

STRENGTH AND ATTRACTIVENESS OF SOCIALISM 24

CHAPTER V

WEAKNESS OF SOCIALISM 32

CHAPTER VI

PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM 42

CHAPTER VII

SOCIALISM AND RELIGION 51

CHAPTER VIII

SOCIALISM AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC 60

CHAPTER IX

THE FUTURE OF SOCIALISM 71

PREFACE

EVERY good citizen of the United States is deeply interested in the welfare of the country. The rights of the common people are as vital as the protection of infant industries. It is often said that the rich are getting richer and the poor poorer. That is only a half truth. The rich are getting richer, but so are the poor getting richer; but the rich are getting richer faster than the poor; and while the American workingman receives the highest wage of any toiler, yet he is not able to purchase the necessities of life to as good advantage as the workingman in some other countries.

The relationship between capital and labor has been strained for generations. There is a "Land of Eden" somewhere in the realm of figures where just the correct percentage of profit goes to each side. But it is difficult to discover the land. With the strong arm of power, capital grasps much more than its share, so labor declares. With the strong arm of the strike and boycott, labor demands too large a share, so capital asserts. The common

ground, satisfactory to both sides, is difficult to discover. Men have struggled with the problem, but the solution is not found except in isolated cases.

As one method suggested for the solving of nearly all social problems Socialism has been presented by its friends. It is a scheme to do away with both capital and labor *per se* and make every person both a capitalist and a laborer. It is a large scheme when fully inaugurated, and it has its advantages; but the question remains, Is it practical? With a warm regard for the laboring man, with which class he spent all the early years of his life, and with deep respect for very many strong and talented men who have pushed industry up into large success, the writer sends out this message with an earnest desire that all the good features of Socialism may be speedily adopted by the people of the nation, but with just as earnest a prayer that we may be saved from the complications and oppressions which the adoption of the whole scheme would surely bring to us.

A. R. J.

Flint, Michigan, January, 1913.

INTRODUCTION

Socialists insist that because the church does not advocate their peculiar economic system therefore the church is untrue to the teachings of Jesus Christ. They declare that Socialism is merely a practical expression of Christian ethics and the evangel of Jesus, and that Jesus came into the world primarily to establish a coöperative commonwealth which is to be fully realized in Socialism. They insist that Karl Marx, the founder of modern Socialism and a hater of Christianity, more nearly presents the ideals of Jesus than does any other man who is not a Socialist, no matter what else he may believe.

As a matter of fact, nobody can prove from Scripture that Jesus was the advocate of any social system. He came neither to establish an ideal republic nor a utopian democracy. He came to establish an absolute monarchy, which shall be composed of all those who acknowledge his kingship.

Only those who are blinded by self-interest or ignorance would declare that the present economic

system is all that one could desire. The United States is the greatest country in the world so far as production is concerned, but in the matter of distribution we are not so fortunate. Practically all reformers agree with the Socialists, when they portray the evils which we are fighting; but many of them part company when it comes to advocating a remedy whereby these evils are to be abolished. Surely, the church cannot adopt and advocate Socialism as the only economic system whereby society is to be saved, because if it were to do so, it would be an injustice to the Christian men in the church who are convinced that there are other economic systems which are more in accord with their ideas of social reform than is Socialism. The church does not exist primarily for the purpose of advocating an economic system. It gives every man the right to believe as he chooses concerning such things, so long as there is nothing immoral or unethical in the program which he accepts.

When the average man says that he is a "Christian Socialist" he means to place the emphasis upon the word "Christian," while the Socialist, who is looking for his influence and his vote, places the emphasis on the word "Socialist." Mean-

while that "Christian Socialist" is giving Socialism the credit for his Christianity. There is no more reason why a man should call himself a "Christian Socialist" than there is that he should call himself a "Christian Republican" or a "Christian Democrat." So-called "Christian Socialists" frequently try to excuse their position by appealing to the honored names of Kingsley and others who described their doctrine, many years ago, as "Christian Socialism." These men omit to mention the fact that neither Maurice nor Kingsley taught a single principle or doctrine of Marxism or any other kind of modern Socialism. As Professor Flint remarks: "When they maintained that social organization must be preceded by individual reformation; that trust in state aid or legislation was a superstition; that self-help was the prime requisite for the amelioration of the condition of the working classes; that coöperation should be voluntary and accompanied by appropriate education; that, so far from private property being robbery, it was a divine stewardship; and that men could never be joined by brotherhood, . . . but must first feel that they had one common Father, they struck at the very roots of Socialism."

What, then, should be the attitude of the church toward Socialism? While the church cannot accept and advocate Socialism, it recognizes the following facts:

First, that a man has a perfect right to be a Socialist, if he is convinced that Socialism is morally and economically sound.

Second, that it is quite possible for a man to be a Christian and a Socialist too. There are certain forms of Socialism which are not antagonistic to Christianity, although it should be remembered that there is no necessary relationship between the two—one being an economic system and the other a religion.

Third, the church does not stand for the present economic system. It stands only for so much of it as is in accordance with the principles laid down by Jesus Christ. The economic system under which we are living is not ideal. There is much in it which must be remedied, and good men everywhere must seek to bring about a fairer condition in behalf of the toilers. This will never be accomplished by soup-kitchens and bread-lines. Workingmen demand justice, and they are right.

Fourth, the church does not preach the gospel of Jesus Christ in order to make men satisfied

with their present economic condition, nor because they desire to offer it as a mere sop. It does not preach this gospel, fearful lest workingmen are about to bring about a great revolution, but it preaches the same gospel with all of its hopes and aspirations, as well as its duties and obligations to workingmen and employers alike.

CHARLES STELZLE.

New York City, February, 1913.

CHAPTER I

Foreword

When Karl Marx issued his volumes on Capital, about 1848, he laid the foundations upon which Socialism has been constructed. His ideas rooted in Germany, and when he was exiled to England he carried with him the principles of Socialism, and shortly they were finding a lodging place in the minds of the working classes there. Soon they were winning a hearing in France, Austria, and Italy, but they did not find much favor in the United States until many years later, and it is only within the last ten or fifteen years that Socialism has attracted any particular attention here. I shall have very little to say regarding the Socialism of Europe, but shall confine the discussion almost entirely to its growth and characteristics in America.

The Socialistic vote in the United States has been as follows:

1892	21,164
1896	36,274
1900	87,814
1904	402,283
1908	420,464
1912	900,672

Leading Socialists proclaim that were it not for the organization of the new party in 1912 their vote would have swept far past the million mark, and they are freely predicting that within a comparatively few years they will have control of Congress and a President in the White House.

Professor Hoxie, of the University of Chicago, claims that there are now over a thousand Socialists holding office in thirty-six different States, and that there are fifty cities with Socialistic mayors, and three hundred towns which have one or more aldermen belonging to the party.

Socialism is therefore so strong that every citizen should be informed regarding it. This is an attempt at a sane, practical, unprejudiced discussion of what Socialism really is, and the results that would follow should it ever be adopted.

CHAPTER II

What Socialism Is Not

There are serious misapprehensions concerning Socialism in the minds of many people. Some associate it with communism, anarchism, or even nihilism. It is safe to say, however, that real Socialism has little or nothing in common with any of them. Nihilism is negative, destructive, annihilative, and has no constructive policy whatever. Anarchism advocates entire lack of either law or government. It denies the right of government to govern, and argues that society has no rights over the individual. The red flag of anarchism means blood, war, riot, while the red flag of Socialism is intended to typify the rich, red blood of a common brotherhood. Communism seeks a condition of society where everything is held in common, or where there is as absolute a condition of equality as can possibly be, even to common ownership of income. Socialism holds for individual incomes. Socialism has much in common with communism, but it is not communism. The old story illustrates the point:

Pat asked Mike what Socialism was.

"Does it mane whin yez hav two houses yez will giv me wan?"

"Sure," said Mike.

"Does it mane whin yez hav two cows yez will giv me wan?"

"Sure," again replied Mike.

"Does it mane whin yez hav two pigs yez will giv me wan?" asked Pat.

"O, go on wid yez," said Mike; "yez know I've got two pigs."

Now, the men were discussing communism, and not Socialism, although many people confuse the two. The aim and purpose of Socialism, as defined by its advocates, is to produce a condition of society that will prevent both dire poverty and inordinate private wealth; and while Socialism has a communistic tendency, there is no disposition to have the rich divide with the poor directly. The purpose is to bring about such a condition of society that no person could be either very rich or very poor.

CHAPTER III

What Is Socialism?

It is not easy to answer this question, for Socialism is an intricate scheme and assumes somewhat different forms in separate places. Primarily, it is an industrial movement, and it is this phase of the propaganda that should be credited with the responsibility for its growth. The following is often given as a short, terse definition: "Socialism is the collective ownership of all the social means of production, distribution, and exchange and the democratic management of the same."

The Socialists object to the term "government ownership," and much prefer the expression, "collective ownership," or ownership by all of the people. The following quotation from one of their newspapers gives their own definition of what Socialism is:

1. Collective ownership of the means of producing and distributing wealth, such as mines, lands, factories, railroads, mail, express, telegraph, and telephone service, light, water, and heating plants, etc., so that private

monopoly, graft, and extortion would be impossible, and rent, interest, and profit will be abolished, and all may have the full product of their labor.

2. Private ownership of wealth, such as homes, vehicles, furniture, books, pictures, etc., according to the value of one's labor. Socialism means the public ownership of capital, the private ownership of the products of one's labor; the public ownership of the means of life; the private ownership of life itself.

3. Direct legislation through the initiative, referendum, and imperative recall, so that the people themselves may rule promptly as they please in spite of councils, Legislatures, Congresses, or courts.

4. A new system of money, issued by the government alone and limited so that it will be a true medium of exchange only, not a medium of exploitation as now.

The basic principles of Socialism are contained in the first two statements above. The last two are merely corollaries. Professor Richard T. Ely has given us four important principles of Socialism in his volume on Socialism and Social Reform. He says, first it means "Common ownership of the material instruments of production." All Socialists agree on this. The moment anything serves as a means of income that moment the state must step in and own that thing, whatever it is. At the present time the government, for the people, owns the Panama Canal, the lakes and rivers, the highways, the mail system, the public schools, the

army and navy, and oftentimes public buildings used for public purposes, such as armories, post offices, courthouses, city halls, etc. As Socialism prevails, the telegraph and telephone lines, gas and water plants, railroads, mines, factories, shops, farms, stores, and everything producing wealth, or where wealth is produced, would all come under the control and ownership of the state, and the state would be the only employer of labor in the country. That is the first and most important principle of Socialism.

The second principle of Socialism, according to Professor Ely, is, "Common management in production." This means supervision and state authority over every factory, mine, shop, farm, office, store, or other place where labor is performed or man or woman employed. It must include restaurants, hotels, rooming houses, barber shops, bowling alleys, rinks, theaters, circuses, and everything else which human ingenuity has devised as a method of earning a livelihood. As there could be no private property producing an income, every person would have to be employed at some task in order to provide himself a living, and thus every person would be in the employ of the people and working for the government.

The third principle of Socialism, according to Professor Ely, is, "Distribution of income by the common authority." That, of course, would follow from the other two principles. No person or corporation could have any employees except the government, and the state would have to see that every person had some employment from which he would receive sufficient income in order to live. As women take their place by the side of men as equals in every way under Socialism, the government would have to provide work and an income for every woman as well as for every man. Early in their propaganda the Socialists argued that, no matter what the work, all incomes should be equal. That seemed to be ideal and brotherly. The difficulties which that theory led them into, however, have finally compelled them to modify the plan, and now very few of them argue for an equal wage.

The fourth principle of Socialism, according to Professor Ely, is, "Private property in the largest proportion of income." By that is meant that each person would have the spending of his own money, and have absolute ownership of his personal property as long as he did not use it as a source of revenue. Whenever any personal prop-

erty becomes a source of revenue the state would have to assume control of it. A man might own his own house under Socialism, but he could not rent a room in it, nor take a boarder, for that would be a private source of wealth, which is entirely contrary to the very fundamental principles of Socialism. The state will have to provide homes and rooms for all who need them, and restaurants and hotels for all who apply.

While Socialism is not communism, yet the ideals of Socialism are that there shall not be great differences between people in either wages, incomes, homes, or conditions of living. The following definition of Socialism, given by Dr. Stelzle, is absolutely correct: "Socialism is the ownership by the people of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange, democratically administered." That is Socialism.

CHAPTER IV

Strength and Attractiveness of Socialism

The very growth of Socialism is sufficient proof that it has attractiveness.

1. One of the greatest sources of its strength is that it has a program which includes every man, woman, and child, and presents a theory of living which guarantees to solve the problem for everyone. Anything that advertises to do that will attract attention and gain followers, for the problem of making a living is a serious one to most people. There have been a good many plans launched to help a few people, or some people, or certain classes of people, but never before a scheme to lift up a whole nation and a world. Insurance companies are an aid to those who are protected by their policies; secret societies reach out a helping hand to those who are members of the particular order; trades unions plan to be an aid to those who join; but Socialism comes with a scheme for wiping out the slums and poor tenements, for annihilating poverty and raising the submerged tenth,

for unseating the plutocrats and destroying the caste and class idea, and for making the nation, and finally the world, one big family of brothers and sisters, all on a common level—the children of a multimillionaire paternal government!

Such a scheme is attractive to many people, for most folks are struggling at great odds for a livelihood, and the materials for to-morrow's dinner are nowhere in sight. Many people feel themselves to be the under dog in a very unequal fight, and the future looks dark and hopeless. The very poor and the moderately poor compose the majority of the population. The rainy day is coming, and there is no financial umbrella in the savings bank which can be used to keep off the rain in the approaching storm.

To such Socialism comes with its roseate-hued pictures of ease and plenty and the proletariat cry, "A master artist has come!" As dry, desert sands absorb water, so the poor drink in the message of Socialism. It places women on an equal plane with men; it has a plan for retiring people at about sixty years of age upon a comfortable pension; it guarantees to provide liberally for the aged, crippled, infirm, feeble, and all those unable to provide for themselves, and as the soap-box

orator proclaims such things he makes converts rapidly.

2. Then Socialism is a scheme for preventing the tremendous waste of competition. Under our present system this waste is immeasurably appalling. The railroads furnish a striking example. Professor Ely estimates that the competitive lines between Chicago and New York alone have cost $200,000,000 to build and equip, or sufficient to erect 200,000 homes at a cost of $1,000 each! The running expenses of competing lines entail a continuous waste. In our country alone the waste in building and equipping railroads has run into an estimated thousand million of dollars, or sufficient to provide a comfortable home for every person in the land!

But railroads are only one source of this waste in competition. A similar drain, if not as large, is found everywhere. Competing telegraph and telephone lines, gas works, factories manufacturing stoves, furnaces, furniture, vehicles, glass, crockery, and clothing all add to the waste. Each article must be advertised; traveling men must go from place to place at large expense to sell, and we have a thousand stores and merchants engaged in business where a few could supply every

demand of the public if conveniently located and organized. A dozen milkmen cross and recross a city, taking the time and labor of three men where one man would do were the routes systematized. All this cost of manufacturing, advertising, selling, delivering, maintaining must be paid eventually by the consumer—and it is pure waste! The trend of modern business methods is toward concentration. Ten thousand articles can be made at a smaller cost per article than a hundred.

Under Socialism every article of commerce would be manufactured in central factories in large quantities and distributed from the factories directly to retail dealers. There would be no competition in either manufacture or sale, therefore no need of advertising, salesmen, or middlemen. The scheme looks quite ideal on paper, and sounds well from the street corner. The Socialists also claim that there would be no waste from strikes, lockouts, shutdowns, riots, etc., where now millions of dollars are worse than lost.

3. A third source of the strength of Socialism is in its scheme for a more equal division of the world's wealth, preventing vast riches on the one hand and dire poverty on the other. Everyone will freely admit that there is much that is unsatis-

factory in our present distribution. Here is a gilded youth, the son of a rich father, who races through the town in a big red automobile, and who spends a thousand dollars in one night in a drinking and gambling debauch with like companions and fast women. His life is a stench to the community, and he has never done an honest day's work in his life nor earned an honest dollar. Over there is a beautiful girl with latent talent for culture and refinement, but she is compelled to stand behind a counter for nine hours a day for six days of the week in order to earn the five dollars which will make possible her support, when added to the aid received from her father. All that is holy within us revolts at the injustice, but the injustice continues. If there is any remedy, under our present system, it has not yet been discovered and applied.

Under Socialism there will doubtless be gilded youths, but the fathers will not be millionaires! Fast young men will have some work to do in order to earn a living, for the theory is a man for every job and a job for every man. There will be no "Weary Willies" around at the back door begging for a "handout," neither will there be any still more "Weary Willies" in the front parlor

gushing small talk with the "Languid Lillians"—idle daughters of the idle rich—for every woman must also work if she would live. Of course, with the short hours of labor promised, there will be much time for visiting and social intercourse, but each person will be a laborer! The Bible teaches that if a man will not work, neither should he eat, and it is wholesome doctrine. The world is no place for a young man with muscle and brains who is "retired" and living as a parasite upon the interest of the capital his father wrested from the sweat of other generations even though the father himself did sweat in order to win.

Socialism looks with great disfavor upon the legacy and recommends that all estates be absorbed by the government in three or four generations, by a heavy inheritance tax. It thus would bring an end to the capitalist class, make every man a toiler of some kind, uplift the submerged classes, and bring in a true brotherhood. At least it says it will, and that is a source of its strength.

4. Socialism disapproves of lavish personal expenditures and approves of generous public appropriations. Under its regime the individual must live simply, for he will not have wealth to squander; but the state, being rich, may spend

lavishly for the benefit of all the people. There will be parks, playgrounds, libraries, drives, walks, schools, halls, gymnasiums, baths, clubs, social centers, recreation grounds, and everything that money can buy, that all the people may have pleasure, comfort, and conveniences. To-day only the rich man has his club; the poor must be content with the saloon. Socialism pictures every person with his club, or some public building that answers the same purpose, and with scores of other conveniences for comfort and amusement, and that is attractive to very many.

5. Then Socialism claims to have the only solution of some of the most vexed problems of the day, such as taxation, child-labor, hours of labor, compulsory education, prostitution, difficulties between capital and labor, etc. If it would work out as many of its advocates expect, many of these problems would be settled; but some of them are as old as the human race, and will not yield a solution even to Socialism, as we shall try and show a little further along.

6. Socialists are bitter opponents of war. It is estimated that it costs the nations $8,000,000,000 annually to be prepared for war, to say nothing of the men it withdraws from productive employ-

ment. Socialism advocates peace and the settling of all international questions by arbitration. If the time ever comes when the working classes refuse to fight, wars must cease, for the capitalist class have no desire to undertake the dangers of war unless in positions of rank. Then they are far too few to make an army. As long as kings and emperors can secure recruits from the workingmen there may be wars; but if the time ever comes when kings and emperors must themselves settle their difficulties with pistols at fifty yards, or submit to arbitration, there is no question as to which method would prevail. More and more civilized nations are coming to abhor war as barbarous, expensive, sinful, indefensible, and the Socialists have struck a popular note when they say, "We will not fight." These are some of the reasons Socialism has grown so remarkably during the last few years. Jane T. Stoddart sums up the strength of Socialism in these three statements:

1. "In the honor it puts upon labor."

2. "In the lofty motive it sets before the worker."

3. "In the shield it throws over the weak things of the world."

CHAPTER V

Weakness of Socialism

Even the most frenzied advocates of Socialism admit that there are some weaknesses and some unsolved problems. While many of the theories of Socialism seem attractive, yet, when analyzed, the whole scheme is so impractical and so impossible, should an attempt be made to carry it out, that its failure is unquestioned. Like Populism, it will have its day and die; but many of the more sane principles will gradually be adopted by other parties and finally by the people.

1. Perhaps the first thing that should be mentioned as a weakness of Socialism is that it could never produce the actual ideal conditions which its advocates promise. Their speakers proclaim and their literature is full of descriptions of a time coming when everyone shall be happy, have plenty, work only six hours a day, and receive not less than $2,000 a year, with the cost of living very low, and when everybody shall have the luxuries and delicacies that now are enjoyed by the comparative few.

Of course that can never be. Professor Carl E. Perry, of the University of Michigan, is authority for the statement that the average wage of the laboring man in the United States is about five hundred dollars per year; and that if all the incomes of all the people in the country were pooled and then equally divided, each person would receive but about six hundred dollars per year. Now, such an income would not be sufficient to buy the real necessities, let alone luxuries and delicacies, even though there were a large reduction in the price of materials.

The story is told that once an anarchist went to Rothschild demanding money. The banker took twenty-five pounds from his safe and gave it to the man, remarking as he did, "Here is your share of the world's wealth; go away and never complain again; you have your part." I presume the story is not true, but the figures are accurate; and it shows that an even distribution of wealth would not make everybody rich.

Socialists complain that some people have meat, strawberries and cream, plum-puddings, quail-on-toast, etc., while others live on cornbread or rice. Some people dress in silks and satins, ride in automobiles and have servants to wait upon them,

while others have none of these things. But they promise all of these things and more when Socialism comes. But it is easy to see that if workingmen's wages are multiplied by four, and the hours of labor divided by two, it would mean the cost of production would advance to eight times the present schedule; and even should all profits be eliminated, still the cost of produce would be far, far in advance of the present scale. Then, a little serious thinking along other lines will show their promises to be idle dreams. There is not enough meat produced, nor strawberries raised, nor silk manufactured so that all people can have them. And there never can be. Larger quantities of meat can be produced only by giving up larger sections of land for grazing. But land for grazing is becoming less available with each passing year. While the population increased twenty-one per cent last year, the cattle supply increased only eight per cent. There never can be sufficient luxuries produced so that everybody could have them. It may be argued that delicacies would be distributed more equitably under Socialism. But that spoils the picture they paint of conditions under their rule, and it would mean dissatisfaction and unrest should Socialism prevail.

There could never be much luxury and ease under Socialism, for servants and service are always essential to easy living. The rich in this age live in luxury because they are able to procure service. Under Socialism carried out to completion there will be no service because there will be no servant class. Every man will have to do his own work—polish his own shoes, empty his own ash-barrel, spade his own garden, milk his own cow, drive his own automobile, mow his own lawn, put up his own stove pipes, and keep the snow from his sidewalks. Every woman will have to wash her own dishes, sweep her own house, dust her own furniture, polish her own stove, for there will be no hired man nor servant-girl, for everybody will be in the employ of the government. When an aristocratic Englishman saw President Lincoln polishing his own shoes he said, "In England gentlemen do not polish their own boots." "Indeed," replied Mr. Lincoln, "then, pray whose boots do they polish?" I am not arguing that there should be a servant class, but I am saying that dreams of ease or luxury without a servant class are idle, idle dreams.

In Edward Bellamy's interesting book, Looking Backward, which pretends to describe condi-

tions under Socialism, Dr. Leete's family seem to be having a very ideal time. When they are hungry they go out to a meal; when they want music either day or night they turn the spigot and it is forthcoming. The doctor and Miss Edith sit around the house, or go strolling or riding, and Mr. West has a fine, idle time with them, and concludes Socialism is a great thing. But Bellamy does not tell us who peeled the potatoes they had for their dinner; nor who cooked the squash and waited upon the table, or washed the dishes afterward. He doesn't tell us who were the musicians who were playing upon instruments day and night in order that they might be entertained. He does not take us on a trip through the factories where the materials were produced that were for sale in the ward stores, nor does he describe the life of the clerks who sold the goods or the men who delivered them. He doesn't say who cleaned the streets, stoked the furnaces, or ran the streetcars. Dr. Leete was evidently passed sixty, so he was retired on an annuity, but Bellamy does not say why it was Miss Edith was lolling around home permitting Mr. West to fall in love with her instead of being off all day, or even six hours a day, in some factory weaving calico, rolling cigars,

or washing the windows in the basement of some one of Uncle Sam's numerous public buildings. Some women will have to be doing those things under Socialism—why not Miss Edith Leete, please? For Socialism is no respecter of persons! There are a good many questions some people would like to ask Bellamy were he alive to answer them. The world's work will have to be done even under Socialism and there are unnumbered disagreeable tasks.

2. Another weakness of Socialism is its utter inability to solve the agricultural problem, when all lands come under government management. We have much land. Certain sections are adapted to certain crops. But how could the state possibly run and control all farms? How could the government regulate hours of labor on a farm? or how secure the crops? or how prevent the use of the products by the farmers? or how see that the products were saved and sold to the best advantage?

It would mean that every twenty-acre plot would have to have a watchman, and every watchman would need to be watched. Large factories can produce articles cheaper than small factories, but large farms have not proved as economical to work as small farms. Socialists have struggled

and strained over the problem of agriculture from the beginning, and it is no nearer solution now than it was in the day dreams of Karl Marx in 1848.

3. Another weakness of Socialism is that it has little place in its regime for men of special ability and peculiar talents, such as poets, writers, inventors, musicians, artists, actors, organizers, and captains of industry. It seems attractive to the man who works with his hands, but it offers nothing to the man who works with his brains. Indeed, there is little incentive to mental ingenuity. Under our present system nearly every man who achieved greatness has pushed his way up from the bottom. Nearly every great man was once a poor boy. The very struggle was a part of the secret of his success. The most of the great poets and painters persevered notwithstanding the opposition of parents and friends. Inventors have struggled on through poverty and starved their way to success. The great musicians and actors have fairly forced their way up and compelled fame to capitulate to them. But what would be the conditions under Socialism?

The Socialistic state is pledged to help every person to his peculiar bent, to aid him to succeed.

At the present time there are usually a score of young people who think they have special talent where there is one who really has. Under Socialism the number of applicants for honors will be tremendously increased. Shall the state support them while they attempt success? To-day the world swings on its way indifferent to latent genius. Only those who know they will win continue to try to win. The others drop by the wayside. Who will say but that the very struggles necessary form an important part of the ladder up which they climb to success?

To-day there are two things which attract genius—fame and wealth. For years John Harrison worked at the chronometer, worked in poverty and hunger for the prize of $100,000 which the British government had offered for an instrument which would tell longitude to within sixty miles. Under Socialism there will be no prize of wealth to tempt men to struggle, and the principal incentive to invention and special achievement will be gone. There are very great evils in connection with our present system of competition, but there are also compensations. The very keenness of the rivalry has resulted in the development of some of the very brainiest men the world has

ever known. Under Socialism there will be no competition and, consequently, no development of the very kind of brains which have been the vital force in our civilization. The result will be stagnation, then corruption, then death. It is a vital and a fatal weakness to the whole system.

4. One of the most effective arguments Socialists make in favor of their plan is that now the country is under the control of trusts and a political ring. One would think that they had never thought to figure out that under their regime there would be a far bigger trust and the greatest political ring the world could ever produce! The state would own and control everything. But what is the state? or who is the state? The state is the people, but the people must have individual representation before they can act. Some person or persons must be clothed with authority. Under Socialism that authority would be greater than any king or earthly potentate now has and far greater than any human being ever should have. Every industry would have to be organized by the government. There would have to be foremen, overseers, managers, superintendents, and executives for every farm, shop, factory, store, or other industry in the country. There would be higher

officers for the counties; still higher for the State, and still higher for the general government. There would have to be wheels within wheels and such a complex political machine and such a rush and rage for office as the world has never seen, and never should be permitted to see. It would be absolutely necessary for men to be clothed with such authority as generals have in war times in order to assign men to their various tasks and compel men to do disagreeable things which they would not care to do. If there is "wage-slavery" now there would be a "work-slavery" then a thousand times more bitter and domineering. To secure these positions of authority a political ring would develop and such a state of rush for power as would soon lead to either revolution or ruin.

CHAPTER VI

Problems of Socialism

These problems might, very properly, be classed with the weaknesses of Socialism, for many of them are vital defects absolutely prohibiting the possibility of Socialism ever coming into power.

1. Take the matter of control. How is the state to get control of all the material instruments of production? Four solutions have been suggested.

First, that each person quietly disgorge and turn everything he has over to the state. But that is no solution; that is hopeless as humanity is now constituted.

Second, that the state shall buy the property from the present owners, giving them compensation. There are two fatal defects to that. First, the state does not have money enough to do it, and it would hopelessly involve the state in financial ruin to try to do it; and, secondly, if the state should do it, it would thus create a capitalist class, who would live upon the money thus secured, and that would be as bad as the present system.

Third, that the state simply confiscate all the property—take it red-handed from the present owners. But the present owners might fight for their own, and as Socialists refuse to fight, how could they take the property?

Fourth, it has recently been suggested that as Socialism gradually comes into power laws be passed making it impossible to leave property to relatives by will or legacy; that estates be subjected to an inheritance tax of one third their value, and thus, in a few generations, the state would own everything. Perhaps that is the most feasible plan yet suggested, but there would be strong opposition to this from almost every person who has property to leave to friends.

2. But a far greater problem is the matter of the division of labor under their regime. Socialism guarantees an education to every young person, and, as a rule, educated people do not voluntarily choose to perform manual labor. With every young man educated, with women receiving equal pay with men for equal work, who will do the actual manual labor—the hard, disagreeable tasks which still must be done? Who would choose to work in the machine shop when he wants to work in the office? Who will drive a team out

in the cold or heat when he thinks he ought to be managing a department? Who will fire the furnaces in the factory when he thinks he ought to be keeping the books? Who will work at night at some disagreeable task when he thinks he should be allowed to work by day? Who will dig the sewers? who work in the mines? who couple cars, stoke the engines, shovel snow, swing the sledge, clean the streets, wash the windows, feed the pigs, butcher the meat, tend the forge, wait on the tables, or any of the other thousand and one necessary but unattractive tasks? There would be a thousand applicants for every pleasant task and nobody rushing in, offering to do the hard tasks. The result would be that those in authority would have to assign tasks to people as wardens now do in our penitentiaries and that would bring on riot and revolution. Socialism is absolutely impracticable.

To-day many tasks are done because of the wages received, and persons are at liberty to do them or seek other employment. Socialism would be abject slavery of the worst kind. It would not be very long under Socialism before the industrial needs would make it necessary for the state to move men from city to city to meet

the demands of the labor market. Men would be compelled to go whether they wanted to or not, and the only thing different from slavery would be the auction block. The theory of Socialism is that all men are equal. There is a statement to that effect also in that famous document, the Declaration of Independence. But the statement is not true, nevertheless. All men are not created equal. The real facts are that no two persons are equally endowed. Every man is entitled to an equal chance with every other man, and men should be given a square deal; but men are not created equal. Some men are studious and some are inclined toward mechanics; some have tastes for art, poetry, music, and some for farming, sailing, mining; some are diligent, industrious, ambitious, and some are lazy, shiftless, indifferent; some have ability and some do not; some have gifts of leadership and organization; some are followers, helpless, and need a guardian. These are the actual facts; and, as another has said, "Nothing is so unequal as the equal treatment of unequals."

The Socialists began their propaganda with the slogan, "Equal compensation for all!" For a number of years they advocated equal wages no

matter what one's occupation might be. But now they have abandoned the idea as impracticable and visionary. When the German Socialists elected Liebknecht the editor of their paper "Vorwartz" they gave him a salary of $1,800 per year and paid the compositors on the paper only $250 per year. Some of the most rabid advocates thought they should practice the principles of Socialism in their own business. But Liebknecht objected to any reduction, saying he could make far more than he was then making by other employment, so they finally let the matter rest as it was. It may seem a beautiful theory to a man who is operating on the earth with a shovel for the making of a drain that he should receive the same compensation as the man who is operating on the intestinal canal with a scalpel for appendicitis. But the fact is that one man may command fifteen cents an hour for his operation and the other man about one hundred dollars or more an hour for his. When Socialism attempts to give them both the same compensation the surgeon may refuse to be a party to the arrangement. Some Socialists now say that the way they will secure men to do the disagreeable tasks is to permit them to labor shorter hours than others, and now they are begin-

ning to admit that there will also have to be different compensations for different tasks. When that is admitted then the class spirit is present, and men will be graded under Socialism exactly as they are now, and the beautiful theory of brotherhood will be gone. So, this problem of labor and wage, which the Socialists claim to have solved under their theory, still will remain as unsolved as it ever was.

3. Another problem under Socialism is the source of capital for new enterprises. Some one may answer very quickly, "O, the state will provide all capital for new enterprises." But will it? The state is proverbially slow and conservative regarding investments. The automobile industry grew by leaps and bounds in this country because the inventors were able to persuade capital that the investments would be both safe and profitable. It will be another matter to persuade the state to finance new enterprises. At the present time many new industries fail and investors lose all the money invested. Under Socialism it would be the people's money that was lost, and a few such unsuccessful ventures would make the state very conservative. The whole tendency, therefore, of Socialism would be to discourage invention and

manufacture and act as a brake upon the wheels of our civilization.

Socialists are entirely unfair to present-day capitalists. Their literature is filled with the claim that all the increase in value of the finished product over the raw product belongs to labor, and their arguments are based on this false premise. Such arguments, of course, are fallacies. Without capital there would be little for labor to do, for capital originates industries, thus making a demand for labor. There must first be capital in order to secure land, buildings, machinery, raw material, and the maintenance of the companies' affairs until there are returns from the sale of the finished product. When the raw material costs $1,000 and the finished product sells for $2,000 the additional $1,000 above the cost of the raw material does not all belong to labor, nor was it all produced by labor. Part of the increase was earned by the building where the product was made, part was earned by the machinery, a part by the men who purchased the raw material, and a part by the man who sold the finished product, and it is the sheerest nonsense to say that labor produced it all. Only recently a statement was made by a prominent manufacturer that it cost

twice as much to sell an article as to make it. With the withdrawal of competition this cost would be greatly reduced, but it would always be considerable. It is true that far too large a proportion of the profits now go to the capitalist and too small a share to labor; but capital is entitled to its share, for without it there would be no profit any more than there would be without labor. Capital is helpless without labor, but labor is equally helpless without capital. If labor so crowds capital that the prospects of investment will not yield more than government bonds or banks will pay, then capitalists will not venture into industry, and labor will be helpless. There is little prospect of new industry under Socialism: there will neither be the capital nor the motive to venture.

4. If Socialism ever should come into power, the question of supply and demand will be a vexing one. Under our present system the competitors create the supply and then try to create the demand. There was a need but no demand for matches, sewing machines, plows, or automobiles until they were made; then came the public demand. These things were and still are made at a profit, or capital would be withdrawn. Under

Socialism there will be no money to be made in new enterprises; so why start any? Yet the state would be under obligation to furnish employment to every person! The task of supplying work for a population of 100,000,000, which soon will be 150,000,000, is so tremendous that its attempt even by the government is ridiculous. To-day people freely move from place to place in search of work or better conditions. Under Socialism the government would have to sentence men to localities where there was work, whether they cared to go or not.

And if Socialism should prove to be what its advocates claim, would not the problem of supply and demand become more and more complex? If every person is freed from labor and pensioned at sixty, and if all children are guaranteed an education and pleasant employment when grown, would not the population increase by leaps and bounds, and the problem of employment simply swamp the government?

CHAPTER VII

Socialism and Religion

It is a well-known fact that most of the leaders of Socialism in this country are either nonreligious or anti-religious. A great deal of their literature, both books and papers, reeks with criticisms of the church and clergy, and slurs and jeers at the idea of waiting until you get to heaven in order to have rest and pleasure. Their writers make no distinction between the Roman Catholic Church of a thousand years ago and present-day Protestantism. Churches are spoken of as rich men's clubs, and priests and ministers as stool pigeons of the capitalists. Of course it is hardly necessary to deny these charges in toto. There are 35,836,690 church members in the United States, and only a very few people who are rich. And no one will argue that all the rich and mighty are members of churches. It is quite evident, then, to any persons who will stop to think, that nine tenths of the church members belong to the middle and poorer classes. It is safe to say that ninety-nine out of every one hundred priests and

ministers come from the homes of the middle and poorer classes. If nine tenths of the church members and all of the ministers belong to the laboring classes, then why is the church opposed to the laborer? A few ministers and a few churches, possibly, are wealth-ridden, but only a very few. The laboring classes have no better friends than ministers and churches. Then why do the Socialists so continuously run down the church? In the platform of the Socialist party there is a plank which states that Socialism has nothing whatever to do with religion. That plank was inserted only recently, and only after a vigorous debate, and then only by a majority of one vote. It was done in order to silence the opposition of Christian voters and as an attempt to win Christian men. Most Socialistic centers advertise and circulate books and pamphlets which advocate free love, infidelity, and the abolition of the church. It is true that *Socialism* should not be responsible for *Socialists;* but a tree is judged by its fruit. There is nothing in industrial Socialism which necessarily makes it unfavorable to religion, and the sooner Socialists learn that it is wisdom to cease maligning the church or slurring at religion the sooner some of the principles of government they

advocate will find acceptance with the people, and become the law of the land.

Many years ago a pastor lived next door to the professor of French in a university city. When visiting over the back yard fence the professor inquired of the minister if he had read the book he had recently published. On being answered in the negative the professor, who spoke quite broken English, said: "Well, you must see him; I tink you lik him; I put a leedle relijun in; I tink he sell bettar." Men are naturally religious, and any propaganda that makes sport of the divine instinct is destined to complete failure.

It is almost a universal custom for the Socialists to hold their meetings Sunday evenings, and often public addresses are delivered on street corners and in parks on Sunday afternoons. They have two stock arguments in defense of their actions. First, that Sunday is the only day the "poor workingman," as they usually choose to call him, is at liberty, and that is the only evening he can be reached. The second defense is that Socialism is a religion, and therefore their meetings are practically religious assemblies. If one will stand at the doors of any of the theaters of any city on any evening, or even on the street corners of any public

thoroughfare any evening, and see the throngs of workingmen, he will know that the first argument is hardly altogether true, for there will be plenty of workingmen in evidence. Workingmen are at liberty plenty of evenings in the week in most cities and towns. Of the second argument, that Socialism is a religion, little need be said. Socialism is intended to be an industrial movement for the bettering of the working classes. Many people make it all the religion they have, but it is no more a religion than the demand for one-cent postage is, or the reduction of the tariff, or the overthrow of the trusts, or many other questions that are purely economic. Socialists use the Sabbath simply because it is convenient and because they are more or less indifferent to the claims of the church.

That they are doing a great wrong we steadfastly believe. The Sabbath was given for two great purposes, namely, rest and worship. Both are important. The physical man requires one; the spiritual life demands the other if it would live. The loss of the Sabbath means the loss of the spiritual life; the loss of the spiritual life means the loss of the moral life; the loss of the moral life means the wreck of character; for few men who cease attending a public place for wor-

ship ever continue Scripture-reading and prayer. When Socialists choose the Sabbath as the great day for their propaganda meetings they are striking a blow at the foundations of our religious life and are helping wreck moral standards. Good as many of the principles they recommend are, they can never, never be a substitute for the religious life.

Many leading Socialists say unkind things concerning the Christian Church, and belittle its past and present achievements. They are either willfully or ignorantly blind to what the church has done and is doing. Take the matter of education alone. When Christ came to earth comparatively few people could either read or write. The church has been the mother of education, and for hundreds of years the church was about the only source of education, until the state became permeated with the spirit of Christianity. Our public school system to-day is due entirely to the church, and even now the church builds and endows the most of the seminaries and colleges. Few working men there are who cannot read and write. They owe the blessings of the education they have to Christianity. What has the church done for the uplifting of women? One needs simply to compare the

condition of women in Christian and in non-Christian lands to know. The teachings of the church are responsible for all the hospitals, asylums, homes for the insane, feeble-minded, needy; for all orphanages and charities. Non-Christian countries do not have them. Slavery is disappearing from the earth because the world is learning the spirit of the Master. Not every member of the church has yet caught in its fullness the mind of Christ. But there is no other body or organization on the face of the earth that has so nearly approximated it. Men are learners, and many are slow to learn; but every passing century sees conditions improving and the world seeing more clearly the true teachings of the Man of Galilee. Apelles, the artist, once went to Rhodes to visit Protogenes and found an unfinished canvas in the studio. Picking up a brush, he completed the painting with all of his matchless skill. When Protogenes returned and saw the work of art, he threw up his hands and said, "Apelles has been here, Apelles has been here." A comparison of the conditions before the coming of the Christ and now, or of Christian and non-Christian countries, will compel any fair-minded person to say, "Jesus has been here."

The mistake of Socialism is that it is an attempt to make the world better without making men better. Reformers are apt to forget that behind the problems of a better social condition lies the problem of the better man. Christ recognized the fact that in order to lift the world he must first lift the individual. Socialism is an attempt to lift up the individual by first lifting the world. It cannot be done. It is the old attempt of the man to lift himself over the fence by tugging at his bootstraps. Why is not the church, as a whole, better, and why do not the members show forth more of the spirit of the Master? The trouble is not with the church but with the individuals in the church. In order for the church to be better the individuals must become better. That is the whole problem. It is a problem of human nature. Socialism does not touch human nature. Christianity does. We say, "Corporations have no souls." Certainly not. The only way to reach the conscience of a corporation is to reach the individual men who compose it. And the only possible way to better the social conditions of the world is to first better the life of the individual man. Until men get the spirit of the Master it is folly to attempt real reforma-

tions. Under Socialism there would still be sinful human nature, with jealousy, selfishness, anger, hatred, wrath, fault-finding, passion, lust. Religion is the only thing which has ever controlled or eradicated sin and filled a life with love. If Socialism ignores religion and treats it as an outgrown superstition, it is missing the mark. Indeed, it would be a fatal defect. Not until there develops a Christian Socialism, advocated by devout and righteous men, will there be any hope of a real uplifting propaganda.

Socialism claims to have the only solution of the curse of prostitution. But has it? Under its regime women are to receive equal pay with men for equal work, and every woman will have some work to do. But even then not every woman will be able to dress in silks and satins, live on strawberries and cream, or ride in an automobile all day long. Plenty of women then, as now, will have to wash clothes, peel potatoes, weave cotton, work in factories, roll cigars, stand behind counters, sew, hem, darn, scrub, and just plod, plod, plod, as thousands do now. Men will have control of their own incomes then, and Socialism foretells incomes from four to ten times as large as now. The thousands of women who toil and plod under

Socialism will have precisely the same temptations to sell their virtue then as now. Prostitution will offer an income then as now, supposedly easily acquired. Socialists claim that poverty is the cause of most of the prostitution. The claim cannot be proven. A recent investigator discovered that of two hundred inmates of houses of ill-fame, one hundred and sixty-three of them acknowledged that they lost their virtue and began the evil life through the influence of the dance hall and bad company. Twenty of them were led into ruin through liquor, ten by willful choice, and only seven of the whole number said they were driven to that mode of living through the necessities of earning a living. Socialism will not cure the evil. Nothing but the grace of God in the life will cure the evil. Religion, which so many of the Socialists spurn and scorn, is the only remedy for the ills of society.

CHAPTER VIII

Socialism and the Liquor Traffic

The attitude of far too many members of the Socialistic party toward the temperance reform is wholly unsatisfactory to people interested in reform. In Europe the Socialists are making a study of the effects of the liquor traffic upon workingmen, and many of the most prominent leaders are taking advanced ground in the temperance propaganda. Many individual members of the party in this country are temperate, but, with here and there an exception, the leaders are more or less friendly toward the liquor interests.

I know they argue that they are engaged in a larger task; that their purpose is to revolutionize the whole strata of society and they cannot jeopardize the larger reform by attempting a smaller. But is it a smaller affair? Have the Socialists rightly measured the magnitude of the evil the traffic is doing to the workingman? Is capital itself doing much more to pauperize and degrade the laborer than the open saloon?

The Scandinavian countries have been trying

the Gothenburg system with the liquor traffic and South Carolina tried the dispensary system, or government control. The Socialists' scheme is very similar. Under Socialism the liquor traffic would take its place beside all other industries as a government business and men would be assigned to the manufacture and sale of liquor, possibly whether they cared to engage in that labor or not! Liquors would be supposedly pure; they would certainly be plentiful, and probably cheap. They could be secured in any quantity by anybody at the government stores. The results may be easily imagined. Drunkenness would abound and hell would enlarge herself to make room for a debauched nation.

I know the Socialists argue that men engage in the white-slave traffic and liquor business now because of the enormous profits and that under Socialism all profits will be removed, so then no man will care to engage in the business. But if there is no one who cares to make and sell liquor then, still human nature will be the same and there will still be thousands who will want to buy and drink it. That will make it absolutely necessary for some one to make it and sell it, and as no one would be permitted to make it and sell it

as a private enterprise, the government would simply have to go into the business. Many Socialists claim that poverty is the cause of most of the drunkenness. Others claim that drunkenness is the cause of most of the poverty. If poverty is the cause of most of the drunkenness, then only the poor would get drunk. But the facts do not bear out the statement. If the Socialists would smite the liquor traffic its deathblow, it would do the workingman and the nation its greatest good.

The most thoughtful labor leaders of the world now are taking strong public stand against the liquor traffic. Forty of the most prominent labor leaders in the British Parliament are not only strictly temperate, but the most of them are also members of some Christian Church. John Burns, probably the leading labor leader in England, wrote, "One half of the problem of the unemployed in England is caused by intemperance." John Mitchell and John B. Lennon, two of the foremost labor leaders in this country, make temperance addresses without fear. If Socialists have the real benefit of the laboring man at heart, the first thing they should attempt would be the overthrow of the liquor traffic, for it is the dire enemy of the laboring man in the country.

1. Take the matter of health and longevity. Science is now demonstrating that alcohol is a narcotic and not a stimulant, and that it has absolutely no food value whatever. Hon. R. P. Hobson says: "It is a dehydrating, protoplasmic poison and its use should be restricted the same as any other poisonous drug." During the Boer war the English government discovered that the low vitality of its soldiers was due to the use of alcohol and immediately began a movement that has succeeded in making the English army one of the most temperate in the world. The German emperor, alarmed at the raids of alcohol, has personally urged his soldiers and sailors to cease drinking even beer.

English insurance companies, investigating the death rate of various classes of people, have announced that in a group of

61,215 average people	1,000 die annually
61,215 total abstainers	560 die annually
61,215 liquor drinkers	1,642 die annually

Or, in other words, the death rate for the three classes is as follows:

Average death rate	16.33 to the 1,000
Total abstainers	9.14 to the 1,000
Liquor drinkers	26.82 to the 1,000

Kansas is conceded to be the driest State in the Union. The death rate there before the advent of prohibition was 17 to the 1,000. Now it is 7.5 to the 1,000—the lowest in the world.

Perhaps the following table, which throws much light on the question as to whether prohibition prohibits, will also explain why the death-rate is so low in Kansas.

The figures in the following table are taken from the Brewers' Year Book of 1911, and, therefore, are not prejudiced in favor of temperance. In the first column is given the name of the State and in the second column the number of gallons of liquor per capita used. In the first lists are the prohibition and local option States. In the second list the saloon States:

I.	Gallons Per Capita.
Kansas	.00
Oklahoma	.00
North Carolina	.01
Mississippi	.09
*Alabama	.09
North Dakota	1.35
South Dakota	1.35
Georgia	1.55
Tennessee	3.62
Maine	5.45

*Wet since 1911.

II.	Gallons Per Capita
California	16.65
Michigan	17.68
Massachusetts	19.99
Kentucky	21.37
Indiana	23.89
Connecticut	24.62
Delaware	26.56
Ohio	29.45
Pennsylvania	31.91
Missouri	36.92
Illinois	39.13
New Jersey	39.87
New York	45.31
Wisconsin	64.51

When liquor advocates say that there is more liquor sold in prohibition States than in license States, just quote their own figures given above to prove their mistake.

The table below gives the death rate, per thousand, according to Thomas Oliver, in his Dangerous Trades, between various ages, showing the destructiveness of the liquor traffic on life.

	25-35 Years	35-45 Years	45-55 Years	55-65 Years
Average death rate	7.03	12.4	20.7	36.7
Brewers' death rate	10.8	19.	30.8	54.4

German investigators state that eighty per cent of the people who die of heart-disease are liquor

drinkers. Alcohol burns out the system and sends its victims by a short cut to the grave.

2. Take the matter of wages and effectiveness. Even the moderate use of alcohol makes a worker's job insecure and reduces his ability to earn. Investigations in Munich, Dresden, and the Rhine regions revealed the fact that after a Sunday spent in drinking the workmen performed from fifteen to thirty per cent less work than in days near the end of the week, and, when working piece-work, they lost considerable money. A large automobile factory in Michigan discovered that after the bi-weekly paydays, covering a period of ten weeks, one hundred and ninety men lost $765 in wages through absence because of drinking habits, to say nothing of the money they spent in the saloons while drinking. The United States Census Bureau reports that nearly every industry is discriminating against the hiring of drinking men, as follows:

Agriculturists	72 per cent
Manufacturers	79 per cent
Trades	88 per cent
Railroads	90 per cent

When so many employers are seeking sober men, and when alcohol causes such harm to the

laboring men, why do not the Socialists fight the traffic?

3. Take the number of men employed in the manufacture of liquors to the amount of capital invested, and we find the traffic the enemy of labor.

Capital in manufacturing liquors.....	$831,802,000
Total capital all industries.....	$18,428,270,000
Wage-earners employed in liquor-making.....	64,680
Total wage-earners in United States.....	6,615,046

The liquor interests, therefore, employ only about one per cent of the labor of the country, while they have four and five tenths per cent of the capital of the country. That is, for the capital invested they employ only about one third the number of men other industries do.

Much has been said about the amount of raw material used by the liquor-makers. The following tables tell the story:

Raw materials used by liquor-makers...	$139,199,000
Raw material produced in United States.	12,141,791,000
Liquor interests use 1.14 per cent.	
Farm produce used by liquor-makers....	$50,000,000
Total value farm produce in United States	4,071,000,000
Liquor interests use 1.007 per cent.	

In other words, if the whole business were wiped out, only a little over one per cent of the farm

produce and raw material of the country would be affected. Liquor dealers have been making much ado about nothing.

The liquor dealers employ fewer men for the capital invested than almost any other industry. The following table shows the number of men employed in various industries for every million dollars' worth of capital invested:

Breweries and distilleries	96 persons
Paper and printing	439 persons
Iron and steel	496 persons
Textile factories	578 persons
Leather goods	580 persons
Lumber and manufactures	726 persons
Vehicles and land transportation	858 persons
Women's clothing	1,563 persons
Car construction shops	1,612 persons

Not only do they employ the fewest men for the capital invested, but they pay over to the men in wages the smallest per cent of the total value of the product, as the following table shows:

Liquors and beverages	9.01 per cent
Leather goods	16.53 per cent
Paper and printing	21.64 per cent
Iron and steel products	22.16 per cent
Furniture	27.25 per cent
Lumber and remanufactures	27.46 per cent
Stoves and furnaces	29.25 per cent
Vehicles	34.45 per cent

Socialists are fighting because the laborer does not receive the total product of his labor. Then why not fight the liquor traffic, which is the worst sinner of all? The city of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, is one of the greatest liquor-manufacturing centers in the country. A few facts about the industry there will be interesting. In the three columns below I give, first, the capital invested; second, the number of men employed; and, third, the per-cent of the value of the product paid out in wages:

	1	2	3
Liquor-making	$51,000,000	4,755	6.6 per cent
All other industries	185,358,011	104,461	34.8 per cent

With more than one fifth of the total capital invested, the liquor interests employ fewer than one twenty-third the number of men and pay less than one fifth the per cent in wages. In other words, if the $51,000,000 now invested in liquor-making in Milwaukee were transferred to some other line of industry, the city would be employing 25,000 more men and be receiving more than $20,000,000 per year in wages. When Milwaukee goes dry then will the city really prosper.

4. The liquor business is a curse to general prosperity. Every social service worker acknowledges that from seventy-five per cent to eighty-five per

cent of the poverty and crime is traceable to the traffic.

In dry Kansas, with her 105 counties, there are 53 where there is not a single inmate in the county jail; 65 counties have no criminals in the State penal institutions; 87 have no insane, and 54 no feeble-minded.

Saint Louis, Missouri, is a great liquor city. Perhaps that is why the per capita wealth of the State is only $300, while the per capita wealth of Kansas is $1,700. The per capita savings in the State of Maine amount to $181.15, a sum larger than in almost any other State. The liquor traffic is a curse to the nation and the bitterest enemy of the workingman. It saps his strength, shortens his life, causes him to waste his time and squander his wages; it employs the fewest men and pays back the smallest per cent in wages; it loads the country with criminals and paupers, and increases taxes thereby. If Socialism in the United States is a scheme for helping the toiler, it can prove it nowhere more effectively than by putting a prohibition plank in its platform and fighting squarely for the overthrow of the greatest curse that ever blighted the human race.

CHAPTER IX

The Future of Socialism

What of the future? What will be the outcome of the socialistic movement? Before that question can be answered we must answer another, namely, Why is there a socialistic movement? An eminent judge of the Appellate Division of New York's Supreme Court (Judge Wesley D. Howard), addressing a group of law students recently, said:

> The hugest fortunes, and, in many instances, the most abject poverty of all ages exist in this country—colossal corporations more powerful and wealthy than ancient kingdoms were, gigantic combinations and trusts, under the command of one individual, with more men and money than Athens had at the battle of Marathon. And children are toiling in canneries and families are huddled in dark basements, farms go uncultivated, and the cost of living becomes appalling. And our laws tolerate it. . . . The people are becoming impatient with these discrepancies in justice, and they are demanding each day in a louder voice that there be reforms.

No one can truthfully say that the Judge has exaggerated the conditions. Socialism is a movement among the working classes to try and right

these great wrongs. As long as there are combinations for the restraint of trade; as long as there are jugglings in the stock market and watering of stocks that demand enormous dividends; as long as there is grinding of wages and swelling of profits; as long as children must toil to live and die as they toil; as long as women are underpaid; as long as sweatshops suck lifeblood and corporations oppress the poor, so long will there be a socialistic movement or something closely akin to it. Every time capital becomes arrogant, or wages are cut without real reason; every time a labor union is broken by the high hand of the money power; every time a man must send his wife or child to the shop or mill to help furnish the necessities of life which he is not able to supply, a Socialist is born. And its tremendous growth is proof enough that there is a reason for its being.

It is evident, however, from a study of its propaganda, that it can never be realized in all its fullness. It is visionary, impractical, impossible, and there are problems insoluble. Yet, it is also evident that many of its proposed reforms are needed. The state, or the people, now own the lakes, rivers, roads, army, navy, post offices, public schools, and

many buildings used for public purposes. More and more the people will insist upon the public ownership of things with which all the public has to do. After a long struggle the post office department is authorized to carry packages, and the express monopoly will soon be abolished, as it should be. Cities and towns will demand publicly owned and operated water, gas, and electric plants. Already the demand is heard for public ownership of telephone and telegraph systems. Every monopoly dies hard, but many are marked for death. Cities and towns are seeking ownership of street-car service rights. That must come.

Then later will come the government ownership of railroads and transportation companies, as there now is in Belgium and Switzerland. The struggle will be long and bitter; but it is inevitable. Before long the authorities will be prohibited from giving away mining rights with land sales or gifts. Surface rights in land for farming, homes or industrial uses are all any government should sell. The riches in oil, gas, coal, iron, gold, or silver belong to all the people and should not be sold for a song to individuals. We have bureaus now engaged in digging canals, building warships, enlarging harbors, erecting buildings, and in various

other forms of industry. Why should not another such bureau develop the mining resources of Alaska? Pennsylvania's oil and coal, Michigan's iron and copper, Minnesota's iron, Colorado's silver and gold belong to all the people and should not have been turned over to individuals or corporations. Development and enlargement would be much slower under government control, but the people would have their own. In some far-distant future the government may build a few factories for the manufacture of staple articles, such as stoves, furniture, or crockery, to serve as models in hours of labor, wages, and general conditions, and to set the price of the commodity. For the same reasons it may establish a few general stores; but it is doubtful if the government will ever enter largely into either manufacturing or retail business. The time is probably coming when the state will prevent, by law, any one person from accumulating a fortune running into millions. While thousands of persons are suffering for the necessities of life no one person should be permitted to hoard wealth. The spirit of brotherhood is becoming stronger; the message of the Christ is being listened to as never before. As long as there are persons who are very, very

poor no persons should be very, very rich when the poverty or the riches are preventable. We do not advocate communism—a division of wealth—but the poor should be given an opportunity to work at a liberal wage. Thousands of men are unemployed. Idle men are a menace to civilization. Would it not be a wise measure for the government to undertake the opening of some mines in Alaska, or some new irrigating scheme in the Western territory, or the cultivation of some of its vacant lands? Men who want work should be furnished labor. Men who will not work should be compelled to labor. Idleness is demoralization.

To sum up: A sane and righteous socialistic movement in the United States will probably bring about government ownership of the larger public utilities, conservation of the public wealth, and the reduction of both dire poverty and fabulous wealth.

If Socialism shall aid in any way the accomplishment of these needed things, it will have played its part in the great struggle of the human race toward its ultimate earthly goal.

HX20 .J65
Socialism; its strength, weakness,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00025 7164